DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 478 755 SO 035 118

AUTHOR	Burns, Maureen
TITLE	Connecting Arts Education Policy and Research to Classroom Teaching.
PUB DATE	2003-04-00
NOTE	23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (84th, Chicago, IL, April 21-25, 2003).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Standards; *Art Education; *Educational Change; *Educational Cooperation; *Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; *Fine Arts; Postsecondary Education; State Standards
IDENTIFIERS	California; Mandatory Programs; *Research in Education; *University of California Irvine

ABSTRACT

A national arts research agenda is presently substantiating claims about positive academic and social effects. As a result, states such as California responded with legislative activity that included the arts in mandates for educational reform. This was followed by the development of state content standards in dance, music, theater, and the visual arts to stimulate comprehensive, sequential arts programs in California's K-12 public schools. Yet these policy breakthroughs for arts education and the rhetorical promise of reform have not ensured compliance nor do they correspond to the reality of schooling. This paper describes the balance between this disconnection and provides a historical perspective on public policy and arts education research, and implementation at the local school level. The paper states that in California an emphasis on high stakes testing, including a high school exit examination that has exacerbated the problem and moved the arts to the curricular periphery in K-12 schools. It notes that, to complicate matters, the two large state systems for postsecondary schooling have adopted requirements of one year of visual or performing arts study for entrance eligibility. The Department of Education at the University of California Irvine, is working to build a community of learners to address these problems. The Arts Core research project, providing professional development for teachers, and the ArtsBridge program, building instructional partnerships among artists and K-12 teachers, are two examples of collaborative efforts aimed at successfully integrating the arts into the K-12 curriculum. (Contains 30 references.) (Author/BT)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 478 755

Connecting Arts Education Policy and Research to Classroom Teaching

AERA 2003 Chicago Abstract
by Maureen Burns
Humanities Curator, University of California, Irvine

In the last twenty-five years, the arts have been included in federal education reform legislation, national standards for arts education have been developed, and a national arts research agenda is presently substantiating claims about positive academic and social effects. As a result, states, such as California, responded with legislative activity, which included the arts in mandates for educational reform. This was followed by the development of content standards in dance, music, theatre, and the visual arts to stimulate comprehensive, sequential arts programs in California's K-12 schools. Yet, these policy breakthroughs for arts education and the rhetorical promise of reform have not ensured compliance nor do they correspond to the reality of schooling. This presentation will describe this disconnection and provide a historical perspective on public policy and arts education research, on the one hand, and implementation at the local school level, on the other.

In California, an emphasis on high stakes testing, including a high school exit examination, has exacerbated the problem and moved the arts to the curricular periphery in K-12 schools. To complicate matters, the two large state systems for post-secondary schooling have adopted requirements of one year of visual or performing arts study for entrance eligibility. Ironically, teachers don't have the time or the expertise, in many cases, to teach the arts in K-12 schools, but realize that their students will not be able to continue their education in the state's major universities without arts instruction.

The Department of Education at the University of California, Irvine is working

SO 035 118

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Burns

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

to build a community of learners to address these problems. The Arts Core research project, providing professional development for teachers, and the ArtsBridge program, building instructional partnerships between artists and K-12 teachers, are two examples of collaborative efforts aimed at successfully integrating the arts into the K-12 curriculum. Expanding the concept of literacy from traditional notions, the arts are being enlisted to enhance the linguistic, visual, musical, mathematical, and kinesthetic skills and capacities of California's school children.

Connecting Arts Education Policy and Research to Classroom Teaching
American Educational Research Association 2003 Annual Meeting in Chicago
Maureen Burns, University of California, Irvine (maburns@uci.edu)

Introduction

In the last twenty-five years, the arts have been included in federal education reform legislation, national standards for arts education have been developed, and a national arts research agenda is working toward substantiating claims about positive academic and social effects. As a result, states such as California, responded with legislative activity, which included the arts in mandates for educational reform. This was followed by the development of a framework and content standards in dance, music, theatre, and visual arts to stimulate comprehensive, sequential arts programs in California's K-12 schools.

Yet, these policy breakthroughs for arts education and the rhetorical promise of reform have not ensured compliance nor do they correspond to the realities of schooling. This paper describes this disconnection by providing an historical perspective on arts education public policy and demonstrating the need for implementation at the local school level. Trends indicate that federal legislation works its way into state legislation, which may or may not then be implemented in the classroom. Quickly traveling down the policy road stopping to see the major federal and state landmarks, those that led to or are presently impacting the University of California's ArtsCore program will be the special focus of this paper.

National Trends

From 1977 to 1988, there were three notable national reports demonstrating that learning in the arts has educational value. Coming to Our Senses: The Significance of

the Arts for American Education by the Arts, Education and Americans Panel (1977), Can We Rescue the Arts for America's Children? Coming to Our Senses – 10 Years Later by Charles Fowler (1988) sponsored by the American Council for the Arts, and Toward Civilization by the National Endowment for the Arts (1988). All valuable reports on arts education, the latter was one of the most comprehensive and definitive based on a two-year study requested by Congress (National Endowment for the Arts, 1988).

The bottom line of these publications was that basic arts education did not then exist in the United States and the following will determine if it does now (National Endowment for the Arts, 1988). The four basic arts content areas were not equally represented in terms of teacher training or qualified instructors in the schools and inadequacies in teacher training, compensation, and standing were mentioned as contributing to shortages of arts teachers (National Endowment for the Arts, 1988). They called for comprehensive, sequential arts education for all students. This laid the cornerstone for future policy and marked a dramatic change in direction for the National Endowment of the Arts. The Endowment started taking an active role in educational reform by influencing federal policy and providing financial support for arts education as well as partnering on projects with the U.S. Department of Education (Remer, 1996).

Yet, only one year later, President George Bush and the fifty state governors devised the National Education Goals in which the arts were omitted (Remer, 1996). This exclusion was all the more frustrating since this was the first time in American history that federal and state administrations articulated a national vision for education (Remer, 1996). Arts education advocates mobilized and made an impressive showing in

1991 testifying before the National Education Goals Panel, which was charged with determining how best to achieve the new goals. They successfully demonstrated that the National Education Goals could not be adequately achieved without the arts (Remer, 1996).

In 1994, Congress passed the Goals 2000: Educate America Act (National Visual Arts Standards Task Force, 1994). This legislation finally included the arts in national education goals as one of the core content areas in which students should demonstrate competency (Fowler, 1996). Squarely placing the arts on the school reform agenda, the arts became a part of the national effort to achieve high standards in the core academic disciplines (Fowler, 1996). Although Goals 2000 included the arts for the first time in important federal education legislation, it has not ensured state and local compliance since the states were not required to develop standards in any subject, whether mathematics or the arts (Remer, 1996). Nonetheless, a new era of federal-state-local relations in education began with great promise for arts education (Remer, 1996).

That same year, national standards were formulated for the certification of teachers, for the content of curricula, and for the outcomes of teaching (Remer, 1996). A consortium of national professional associations in arts education supported by the U.S. Department of Education and the Arts Endowment spent two-years developing a national consensus definition of what all students should know and be able to do in the arts (Remer, 1996). Dance, music, theater, and the visual arts were included and the benchmarks of grades 4, 8, and 12 were set (National Visual Arts Standards Task Force, 1994).

From 1995-2002, evidence of the work accomplished to develop a research agenda, recommended in the national reports, became available through three publications starting with Schools, Communities, and the Arts: A Research Compendium (Welch, 1995). The Morrison Institute for Public Policy at Arizona State University developed this valuable source of information about applied and academic research related to arts education on behalf of the National Endowment's Arts in Education Program. A comprehensive review of current arts education research, employing both quantitative and qualitative methods, was provided and almost fifty reports, articles, and dissertations were summarized.

This was followed in 1999 with Champions of Change: The Impact of Arts on Learning compiling information about the impact of arts experiences on young people (Fiske, 1999). The work of seven teams of researchers using diverse methodologies in a variety of arts education programs was summarized. The authors searched for the reasons why positive changes occur as a result of arts education activities and what might be done to replicate positive learning experiences to effect arts education policy changes and advocate for the inclusion of the arts in educational programs, both in and out of school. Researchers provided evidence for enhanced learning and achievement as well as positive social outcomes when the arts were integral to students' learning experiences (Fiske, 1999).

The most recent research analysis was published in Critical Links: Learning in the Arts and Student Academic and Social Development (Deasey, 2002). Sixty-two research studies are summarized including comments on the contribution of each to the field of arts education, primarily by James Catterall, Lois Hetland, and Ellen Winner, but

including other reviewers' perspectives as well. The compendium provides information about the best research being accomplished in arts education. All three of these publications include valuable information about the state of arts education research, but also identify areas where more work needs to be accomplished.

In 1997, the National Assessment of Educational Progress (i.e., "The Nation's Report Card") included the arts in its assessment of national samples of students to determine proficiency in basic subjects for the first time in twenty years (Remer, 1996). It provided substantial performance-based data for analysis of artistic understanding in dance, music, theatre, and visual arts. The report discovered that programs in music and visual arts instruction for eighth graders are well established in most schools, but extensive programs for theatre or dance are uncommon. The relationship of these four arts areas to three arts processes—creating, performing, and responding—was examined. The report generally showed that eighth grade students could demonstrate basic arts skills, but had limited ability (National Center for Education Statistics, 1998). It appears that comprehensive, sequential arts education for all students still does not exist in America's schools. Secondary analysis has highlighted the importance of strong arts programs in the schools with administrative support as well as arts-related activities beyond school, the need for highly motivated arts specialist teachers with the facilities and resources to teach the arts, and the importance of parental support and involvement with schools and teachers (Erickson, 2002).

The most recent legislation, the No Child Left Behind Act, is President Bush's education reform plan asking schools to describe their success in terms of what each and every student accomplishes. Four principles are at the core: 1)

stronger accountability for results, 2) record flexibility for states and communities, 3) concentrating resources on proven education methods, and 4) more choices for parents (United States Department of Education). State's must submit plans and adopt challenging student academic achievement standards that apply to all schools and all children in the state. The states can determine the content areas, but must include at least mathematics, reading or language arts, and, beginning in 2005, science. Where is the art? The Act requires that all teachers in core academic subjects must be "highly qualified" by the end of the 2005-2006 school year (Paige, 2002). Assessment, reporting, and accountability are integral features as well. We have yet to see how this new legislation will specifically impact arts education, but the back to basics tenor does not bode well.

It is evident in this brief summary of national trends that the proponents of arts education have fought a long hard battle to secure a place for the arts in America's public schools and it is by no means over. Remer summarized the progress to date as including the following:

> Voluntary national goals that include the arts; voluntary national standards that include the arts; a national research agenda for the arts; legislation providing money for the arts to states and local school districts if they, in turn, elect to include them in their education plans; compensatory education funds for the arts—again; strong state and local arts agencies with articulate national leadership organizations; diminished but enduring arts and humanities endowments and an institute for museum services with arts education agendas; several corporate, public and private foundations acting as stalking-horses, taking risks for the field; coalitions, partnerships, alliances, networks—all organized around the arts and frequently including education as a priority (Remer, 1996).

Nonetheless, she predicted (Remer, 1996) that arts education is due for one of the inevitable swings in the opposite direction: "There is progress of a sort, but it remains

largely superficial, tangential, and marginal. While we have grown much more sophisticated in our rationales and more comprehensive in our thinking about teaching and learning, there is no visible trend toward systematic change in state and local curricula and no broad-based acceptance and institutionalization of the arts in all our schools and districts. For most of our school children, the arts are still afterthoughts." However, others believe that with the content standards, an assessment framework, and the expanded research base state- and local-level policy actions to include the arts are on the rise (Remer, 1996).

California as a Case

California, like many other states, was greatly influenced by the national trends described above. In 1976, California adopted arts instruction for grades one through twelve as part of the Educational Code. California Education Code, Section 51210, stated that the fine arts, in particularly art and music, should be taught in grades one through six to develop aesthetic appreciation and the skills of creative expression (Thompson et al., 1989). California Education Code, Section 51220, similarly states that the fine arts, especially art, music, and drama, be offered for grades seven through twelve for the same reasons (Thompson et al., 1989).

However, fiscal and political realities created a situation in which progress in the area of arts education was short-lived due to the 1978 crisis brought on, in part, by state financial changes resulting from the passage of Proposition 13 (Brouillette, 2001). Better known as California's "tax revolt," this legislation had a profound impact on local government (Schwadron, 1984). The State Department of Finance's conservative estimate was that between 1978 and 1984 Proposition 13 saved taxpayers and cost local

treasuries almost fifty-one billion dollars (Citrin, 1984). Since local government had to be kept afloat, the state greatly increased its level of financial assistance by assuming local costs thus centralizing fiscal power at the state level (Citrin, 1984). This reduction in local autonomy has led to priorities being increasingly determined outside of local jurisdictions (O'Sullivan, et al., 1995).

It was not the tax revolt in isolation. California's level of spending on public education had been sinking for decades before 1978, but Proposition 13 wreaked enough havoc on local government to provide the public with the notion that it devastated public education in California (Citrin, 1984). Here are two telling examples of how this legislation affected California schools. In 1940 California spent more on public education per child than any other state except New York, but by 1970 there were fourteen states that spent more and by 1980 California slipped below the national average (Schwandron, 1984). The number of arts consultants at the elementary school level shrank from four hundred in 1967 to fewer than thirty in 1981 (Arts Education Advisory Committee, 1990). A prolonged school-funding drought in arts education was part of the legacy of Proposition 13 and it carried over into the 1980's.

Nonetheless, in 1982 the California State Department of Education published the Visual and Performing Arts Framework for California Public Schools: Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve (California Department of Education, 1996). For the first time in California, school districts were provided with a coherent framework for planning a comprehensive K-12 arts curriculum inclusive of the four major art forms (Arts Education Advisory Committee, 1990). Developmental levels of instruction keyed to students' levels of arts attainment—beginning, intermediate, or advanced—guided the

goals, objectives, and teaching activities (Arts Education Advisory Committee, 1990). The arts curriculum was expected to foster four major components of intellectual growth in every student: aesthetic perception, creative expression, arts heritage, and aesthetic valuing (Arts Education Advisory Committee, 1990). The Framework outlines what students should know in the arts and clearly defines a balanced, comprehensive arts program for all those enrolled in K-12 education.

Then, the Hughes-Hart Educational Reform Act, Senate Bill 813, was passed in 1983, which included arts education in its mandates for educational reform (Arts Education Advisory Committee, 1990). The bill called for the establishment of model curriculum standards and defined requirements for high school graduation. The State Board of Education issued a response to Senate Bill 813, which recommended the completion of a year's course work in the visual and performing arts to attain a more rigorous high school education (Arts Education Advisory Committee, 1990). The subsequent legislation required one year of visual and performing arts OR foreign language to receive a high school diploma. Arts educators lobbied for one year of each arts and foreign languages, but were not granted their request (Arts Education Advisory Committee, 1990). Anticipating that the adoption of more rigorous high school graduation requirements in the area of arts education would stimulate more interest and expanded courses, the reality was that arts education was receiving little or no attention in California.

In 1983, California legislative activity in the area of arts education continued with the initiation of the High Schools for the Arts Program. It created high schools for gifted and talented students who want to make the arts a focus of their secondary education

(Arts Education Advisory Committee, 1990). These schools are usually placed in large urban districts in order to address racial or ethnic imbalances. One year later, the State Department of Education's Office of Staff Development established the Fine Arts Curriculum Implementation Center (Arts Education Advisory Committee, 1990). By 1987, there were seven such centers statewide, each dedicated to a basic academic discipline. Then funding cuts eliminated the program (Arts Education Advisory Committee, 1990).

To comply with the mandates of Senate Bill 813, the State Department of Education published Model Curriculum Standards in 1985. The arts were one of seven subject areas encompassed in the Standards. Four central goals for the arts curriculum were identified as follows: 1) The arts teach students a common core of knowledge; 2) The arts connect students to the cultural heritage; 3) The arts develop and refine students' sensibilities; 4) The arts enable students to express their own creativity and experience moments of exaltation, satisfaction, and accomplishment (Arts Education Advisory Committee, 1990). Basically an extension of the concepts found in the Framework, the Standards provide an intentional link to examples of teaching objectives and classroom activities (California Department of Education, 2003). Influenced by the National Standards for Arts Education published in 1994, California's Framework and Standards have since been updated and expanded. California school districts now have current written guidelines for planning, implementing, and evaluating their arts programs, but that doesn't mean that they are doing it (Arts Education Advisory Committee, 1990).

In 1985, California's post-secondary educational institutions responded in kind, with the California State University system establishing a requirement of one year of

visual or performing arts course work for admission to any of its nineteen campuses and the University of California system stating that high school arts courses meeting certain requirements could satisfy admission requirements to their nine campuses (Arts Education Advisory Committee, 1990). It was not until 2001 that the University of California aligned their requirements with the California State system; they are presently phasing in this new requirement. Eligibility to enter either system is based on the completion of 15 one-year college prep courses referred to as the "a-g" requirements with the visual and performing arts being "f" (University of California). High school grades, performance on college admissions exams, advanced coursework taken, and personal attributes are also taken into consideration. One yearlong or two semester courses in the arts--dance, music, theatre, or visual art—are required implementing the intent of the California Department of Education's Visual and Performing Arts Standards.

In 1988, the California State University joined the State Department of Education and the Visual and Performing Arts Staff Development Center in the first combined effort to provide teacher training in the arts (Arts Education Advisory Committee, 1990). The teacher-training summer institute returned forty Cal State faculty to their campuses to work in partnership with K-12 teacher trainers on regional teams to improve the quality of arts education throughout the state (Arts Education Advisory Committee, 1990). This state network would eventually evolve into The California Arts Project providing professional in-service workshops for schools, school districts, and offices of county superintendents of schools (Arts Education Advisory Committee, 1990). The fate of this program is presently uncertain due to drastic budget cuts in California.

Two reports emerged in 1989-1990 reviewing the status of arts education in California's public schools, first Arts Education in California: Thriving or Surviving? (Thompson et al., 1989) and then Strengthening the Arts in California Schools: A Design for the Future. The first report found that since it is up to local school districts to develop and implement arts curriculum, the scope of the programs and availability of course offerings vary enormously by school district (Thompson et al., 1989). It was discovered that for grades K-6 arts teaching usually included arts, music, drama, and occasionally dance, but could only be described as introductory (Thompson et al., 1989). Although a part of the regular curriculum, the amount of instruction and type of arts program depended on the resources and skills of the individual classroom teacher (Thompson et al., 1989). It was concluded that since many school districts do not have teachers trained in the arts or programs in place, "Few students in K-6 receive a full, comprehensive arts education program" (Thompson et al., 1989, p. 5).

The first report provided a wide range of statistics to provide a clearer picture of the state of arts education in California during the late 1980s. In terms of staffing, 1986 statistics revealed that approximately 9% of all full time teaching positions in K-6 and 4.3% in grades 7-12 were directly involved with visual and performing arts education (Thompson et al., 1989). During teacher training, twenty-one semester hours were required in the general subject areas of the humanities and fine arts. However, teacher candidates found it difficult to find arts courses in the State's approved degree programs resulting in teachers entering the profession without taking any arts subjects during training (Thompson et al., 1989, p. 16). In 1987, arts instruction averaged 7.6% of the total instructional time for grades K-6, which amounted to 115 minutes per week

(Thompson et al., 1989). The federal report, Towards Civilization, recommended the arts be 15% of the total instructional time or 270 minutes per week (Thompson et al., 1989). It recommended that California adopt a statewide plan for arts education and require local school districts to follow through in grades K-12 (Thompson et al., 1989). Enhanced teacher training was also recommended to ensure that all teachers trained in state universities and colleges received adequate training in the arts (Thompson et al., 1989). These measures might strengthen arts education in California, but one thing was clear, the arts were surviving and not thriving.

The 1990 report also painted a dismal picture of arts education in California. Teacher shortages were mentioned as acute, "In 1987 the percentage of school districts indicating a shortage of arts teachers was exceeded only by shortages of foreign language specialists in the core curriculum" (Arts Education Advisory Committee, 1990, p. 22). Although the Framework, Standards, and college entrance requirements were in place, school districts have had the major responsibility for providing arts education. A great deal of work still needs to be accomplished to make the goal of comprehensive, sequential arts education a reality for all of California's public school children. As mentioned in the report, "It takes time to bring about change. Building comprehensive arts programs in over 7,000 schools in California to reach nearly five million students will take a sustained effort over many years" (Arts Education Advisory Committee, 1990, p. 20).

From 1998-2002, an emphasis on high stakes testing began in California. Students in grades 2-11 participate in the Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) program and schools are ranked based on their students' test scores (EdSource, 2003).

Testing focuses on the state's academic content standards and generally less than 50% of California's students score at the proficient or advanced levels (EdSource, 2003). In addition to STAR, a norm-referenced test of basic skills was started in 1998 using the Stanford Achievement Test, Ninth Edition (EdSource, 2003). California's students are, on average, performing the same as the national sample, which is not particularly good.

Beginning with the class of 2004, the state's public high school students must pass the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE) in order to receive a high school diploma (California State Department of Education). The test is based on California's academic content standards: the English language arts section tests state standards for grades 9 and 10 including two writing exercises, the math section covers standards for grades 6 and 7 as well as Algebra I. Students have multiple chances to pass the test before graduation and if they pass a section they do not have to take it again. As of spring 2002, 73% of the class of 2004 had passed the English language arts section, 53% had passed the math section, 48% has passed both sections (EdSource, 2003). In some schools, students are not allowed to take electives, such as arts courses, until they pass the exit exam and are instead required to attend remedial language arts and mathematics courses. Combining the high failure rate with the controversial issues surrounding the high school exit examination, it appears that the state may postpone its implementation to 2005 or 2006.

The No Child Left Behind legislation set the guideline that only "highly qualified" teachers may be hired at federally funded Title I schools beginning in 2002-2003. California had almost 307,000 teachers during the 2001-2002 school year and an estimated 30,000 were hired for the 2002-2003 year because of

enrollment growth, retirement, and attrition (EdSource, 2003). Of these teachers approximately 86% were fully certified credentialed with almost 11% in the classrooms under emergency permits. Some of the former and all of the latter do not fit into the "highly qualified" teacher category of No Child Left Behind. In California teachers can earn multiple subject teaching credentials for elementary school, but there are few arts specialists. Single subject teaching credentials can be earned for middle and high school, but music and the visual arts are the only arts specializations presently available, with no sign of theatre or dance credentials on the horizon. How do you obtain "highly qualified" teachers in all four arts content areas, if credentials are not even offered in two of them?

Clearly all the pieces have not fallen into place in California? Good progress has been made at the state level, but in the classroom arts education remains at the curricular periphery. The emphasis on high stakes testing, including a high school exit examination, has exacerbated the problem. To complicate matters, the two large state systems for post-secondary schooling have adopted requirements of one year of visual or performing arts study for entrance eligibility. Teachers don't have the time or the expertise, in many cases, to teach the arts in K-12 schools, but realize that their students will not be able to continue their education in the state's major universities without arts instruction. With an estimated thirty-five billion dollar shortfall in the California Governor's 2003-2004 budget, arts education is yet again on the chopping block. When resources become scarce in schools, the arts are among the first content areas to be discarded (Smith, 1996). The patterns described above indicate that this is a

common practice at both the national and state levels inevitably resulting in poor local arts education implementation.

The experience of the California Arts Council is illustrative. Formed in 1976 by the California legislature and Governor Edmund G. "Jerry" Brown Jr., this organization is charged with promoting "artistic awareness, participation and expression" in the state (Dutka, 2001). Over the years, the California Arts Council has experimented with a variety of programs related to arts education, awarding grants to individuals and nonprofit arts organizations in California, and encouraging performances and services such as lectures, demonstrations, classes, and workshops (Thompson et al., 1989). The California Arts Council generally works towards providing links between artists, arts organizations, community arts groups, and the public schools.

Their budget is composed of annual allotments from the state's general fund, federal grants, and revenue from arts license-plate sales (Dutka, 2001), which rise and fall with fiscal and political realities. For example, a budget of $32 million for the 2000-2001 fiscal year was going to be increased to almost $60 million in the following year until an energy crisis in California and other economic downturns caused drastic cuts (Haithman, 2002, p. F3). The Governor's 2003-2004 California Arts Council proposal is a mere $11.5 million for the state's most well-established arts organization. This would be $2 or $3 million less than what the state spent on the arts during the recession of the early 1990s. How can the California Arts Council possibly sustain its arts education

programming on this financial roller coaster ride? California's boom and bust history certainly seems to be playing itself out in arts education.

Conclusion

With a clear need for enhanced arts education in a disastrous fiscal environment, ArtsCore is providing a partnership model for local-level teacher professional development in which the arts can meet the challenge of high stakes testing and the high school exit exam by demonstrating through practice and research the value of the arts in the classroom. Although the master teachers and other participants clearly understand the intrinsic value of arts education, they are focusing on using the arts to build students' writing and mathematical skills to meet California's present testing challenges. This emphasis on instrumental outcomes assists the students and expands teachers' concepts of literacy helping them to become "highly qualified" teachers along the way.

In this way, ArtsCore is trying to ensure that No Child Left Behind, does not leave the arts behind. They are building a community of learners at the grassroots level who are able to independently meet the demands of federal and state policy, yet customize it to various school contexts. It is evident from this brief survey that handing public policy out from the top down is not an effective way to implement it in the classroom. Perhaps the bottom up would be more successful? The political and economic reality seems to be that arts education initiatives will come and go, many times before they can show any positive effects. What is needed is more research involving teachers and students in classrooms to identify what works and where to go from here. The other papers in this series provide more information about ArtsCore's collaborations and research efforts, which are striving to change this paradigm.

References

Arts Education Advisory Committee. (1990). *Strengthening the arts in California schools: A design for the future*. Sacramento: California State Department of Education.

Arts, Education and Americans Panel. (1977). *Coming to our senses: The significance of the arts for American education*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

ArtsCore. (n.d.). Retrieved April 17, 2003, from http://www.gse.uci.edu/artscore/si.html

Brouillette, L. (2001, February 23). How colleges can work with schools. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, Section 2,* B16-B17.

California Department of Education. (n.d.). *California high school exit examination.* Retrieved April 17, 2003, from http://www.cde.ca.gov/statetests/cahsee/

California Department of Education. (2003). *Content standards for California public schools*. Retrieved April 17, 2003, from http://www.cde.ca.gov/standards/

California Department of Education. (1996). *Visual and performing arts framework for California public schools – kindergarten through grade twelve*. Retrieved April 17, 2003, from http://www.cde.ca.gov/shsd/arts/oldstdasm.htm

Chapman, L. H. (1982). *Instant art, instant culture: The unspoken policy for American schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Citrin, J. (1984). Introduction. In T. Schwadron. (Ed.), *California and the American tax revolt* (pp. 1-69). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Deasy, R., Ed. (2002). *Critical links: Learning in the arts and student academic and social development*. Washington, DC: Arts Education Partnership.

Dutka, E. (2001, March 14). The golden state of arts funding. *Los Angeles Times*, p. F3.

EdSource. (2003). *Resource cards on California schools*. Palo Alto, CA: EdSource Inc.

Efland, A. D. (1990). *A history of art education: Intellectual and social currents in teaching the visual arts*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Erickson, M. (Ed.). (2002). Learning from the NAEP Assessment. *Translations 11,* 1-5.

Fiske, E. B. (Ed.). (1999). *Champions of change: The impact of the arts on learning.*

Washington, DC: Arts Education Partnership.

Fowler, C. (1996). *Strong arts, strong schools*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fowler, C. (1988). *Can we rescue the arts for America's children? Coming to our senses – 10 years later*. New York: American Council for the Arts.

Haithman, D. (2002, May 17). Arts Council budget in jeopardy. *Los Angeles Times*, p. F3.

National Center for Education Statistics. (1998). *Arts education – music, theatre, visual arts, dance: Highlights of the NAEP 1997 arts assessment report card*. Washington, DC: Office if Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education.

National Endowment for the Arts. (1988). *Toward civilization: Overview from a report on arts education*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

National Visual Arts Standards Task Force. (1994). *The National Visual Arts Standards*. Reston, VA: National Art Education Association.

O'Sullivan, A. O., Sexton, T. A., & Sheffrin, S. M. (1995). *Property taxes and tax revolts: The legacy of Proposition 13*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Paige, R. (2002). *Meeting the highly qualified teachers challenge: The secretary's annual report on teacher quality*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Remer, J. (1996). *Beyond enrichment: Building effective arts partnerships with schools and your communities*. New York: American Council for the Arts.

Schwadron, T. (Ed.). (1984). *California and the American tax revolt: Proposition 13 five years later*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Smith, P. (1996). *The history of American art education: Learning about art in American schools*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Thompson, S., Sun, A, & Beattie, L. (1989). *Arts education in California: Thriving or surviving*. Sacramento: California State Assembly Office of Research.

United States Department of Education. (n.d.). *No Child Left Behind*. Retrieved April 17, 2003, from http://www.NoChildLeftBehind.gov/

University of California. (n.d.). *It starts here: A-G course lists*. Retrieved April 17, 2003, from https://pathways2.ucop.edu/doorways/list/

Welch, N. (Ed.). (1995). *Schools, communities, and the arts: A research compendium.* Tempe, AZ: Arizona State University Morrison Institute for Public Policy.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Connecting Arts Education Policy and Research to Classroom Teaching	
Author(s): Maureen Burns	
Corporate Source: University of California, Irvine	Publication Date: April 2003

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

X

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature	Printed Name/Position/Title: Maureen Burns, Curator	
Organization/Address: University of California, Irvine Visual Resources 61 HIB Irvine, CA 92697-3375	Telephone: 949-824-8027	FAX: 949-824-4298
	E-Mail Address: maburns@uci.edu	Date: 07-08-2003

(Over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC/CHESS
2805 E. Tenth Street, #120
Bloomington, IN 47408

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfacility.org

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2001)